



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten Signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,484	02/28/2002	Oh-Young Kim	2818-101	5671
6449	7590	02/02/2004	EXAMINER	
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			GIBSON, ERIC M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3661

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N.	Applicant(s)
	10/019,484	KIM, OH-YOUNG
Examiner	Art Unit	
Eric M Gibson	3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 55-60 and 67 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 61-66 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . 6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. Claim 55 recites the limitation "the intelligent processing" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
 - b. Claims 56 and 57 are necessarily rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 58-60 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Palalau et al. (US006373472B1).

- a. As per claim 58, Palalau teaches an integrated digital control method for an automotive electrical device including logically dividing a plurality of portions of the vehicle into predetermined regions (claim 1, lines 5-8), digitally controlling input/output data of the divided regions (claim 1, lines 11-12), and performing integrated control of the data of a corresponding region (claim 1, lines 17-18).
- b. As per claim 59, Palalau teaches a predetermined switch input is transmitted to all divided regions (column 3, lines 35-40).
- c. As per claim 60, Palalau teaches that the input/output includes control routines included identically in each logic division (column 6, line 64 – column 7, line 6).
- d. As per claim 67, Palalau teaches in the above-cited column 6, line 64 – column 7, line 6 that the CPU 120 intelligently processes the control routine.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-54 are allowed.
 - a. As per independent claim 1, the prior art does not teach or reasonably suggest in combination the system including auxiliary control means for performing input/output control, malfunction detection and automatic control of each portion of the vehicle as claimed.
 - b. Claims 2-22 serve to further define the invention of claim 1 over the prior art.
 - c. As per independent claim 23, the prior art does not teach or reasonably suggest in combination including performing logic divisions of the vehicle into

predetermined regions, performing digital conversion, analysis and integrated management according to the predetermined regions and detecting and controlling malfunctions in the regions as claimed.

d. Claims 24-54 serve to further define the invention of claim 23 over the prior art.

4. Claims 55-57 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

a. As per independent claim 55, the prior art does not teach or reasonably suggest in combination including performing logic divisions of the vehicle into predetermined regions, performing digital conversion, analysis and integrated management according to the predetermined regions and detecting and controlling malfunctions in the regions.

b. Claims 56 and 57 would serve to further define the invention of claim 55 over the prior art.

5. Claims 61-66 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

a. As per claim 61, the prior art does not teach or reasonably suggest in combination the method including that the plurality of control routines includes the detection of malfunctions in the electrical device and control of the detected malfunctions as claimed.

b. Claims 62-66 would serve to further define the invention of claim 61 over the prior art.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see pages 20-23, filed 11/28/2003, with respect to claims 1, 2, 10, 12, and 22 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, 12, and 22 has been withdrawn.

7. Upon further consideration of the broad independent claim 58, indication of allowability has been withdrawn and a prior art rejection has been made. The broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 58 would have the logically divided portions of the vehicle into predetermined regions read onto the division of functions disclosed in the Palalau reference as applied. There is no limitation in the claim that specifies that the regions or portions are in any way physical divisions of the vehicle. The specification discloses this kind of division of the vehicle, however, limitations will not be read into the claims from the specification. Therefore, it is asserted that the broad language of claim 58 encompasses the kind of division being performed in the Palalau reference. As allowability had been indicated in the previous Office Action (Paper No. 7), this rejection is made non-final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric M Gibson whose telephone number is (703) 306-4545. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

EMG



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600